

**REMARKS**

The remaining claims are 1-4, 14, 15. Claim 1 has been currently amended. No new matter is introduced therein. Claims 5-13 have been canceled.

Claim 1 has been objected to because of certain informalities, which have now been corrected. Accordingly, applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,256,922) in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,868). Claim 1 has been amended so that it now recites, in part

a plurality of terminals disposed around said bearing supporter for connection to a plurality of windings of said stator, each of said terminals having an upper face and a bottom face, the upper face of at least one of the terminals being coupled to at least one of the plurality of windings and the bottom faces of the terminals being exposed on a bottom of said motor base and extending substantially parallel to said motor base.

Prior to the current amendment, the Office Action contended that Tanaka showed a terminal 140 for connection to a winding 106 and that the terminal was exposed on the bottom of the motor base. The Office Action relied on Cox to show that a plurality of terminals could be used in the Tanaka device.

Amended claim 1 now recites "a plurality of terminals disposed around said bearing supporter." Tanaka does not show a plurality of terminals, does not suggest that a plurality of terminals 140 would be useful, or that a plurality of terminals could be placed around its bearing supporter 102. The Office Action has relied on Cox to show a plurality of terminals 72. However, the terminals 72 in Cox are disposed around the central housing 64 of a spindle motor connector 20 (col. 4, lines 24-29). The connector provides "the electrical connection path between spindle motor driver circuitry and the stator phases of a disc drive spindle motor." (col. 2, lines 34-37). In other words, Cox does not show a plurality of terminals disposed around a bearing supporter. Therefore, it would not be obvious in view of Cox, to provide in Tanaka a plurality of terminals disposed around a bearing supporter.

Amended claim 1 also recites: "each of said terminals having an upper face and a bottom face, the upper face of at least one of the terminals being coupled to at least one of the plurality of windings and the bottom faces of the terminals being exposed on a bottom of said motor base." Tanaka does not disclose an upper face of pc film 140 "being coupled to at least one of the plurality of windings." Although terminal 140 is connected to stator core 105 via its branches 118, there is no disclosure in Tanaka that "the upper face" of pc film 140 is coupled to a winding. Similarly, pc film 140 in Tanaka does not have a plurality of bottom faces that are "exposed on a bottom of said motor base," and there is no disclosure in Tanaka that the bottom faces of a plurality of terminals should be exposed on the bottom of the motor base and that the terminals should all "extend[] substantially parallel to said motor base."

For all of the above reasons, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. Since claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 1, they, too, are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al.

Claims 2-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al., and further in view of Hiroyasu (JP 09070162). The rejection is traversed. These claims depend from claim 1. As shown above, claim 1 is not subject to rejection over the combination of Tanaka and Cox. Hiroyasu also does not show all of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. and further in view of Hiroyasu. Since claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, they, too, are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. and further in view of Hiroyasu at least for the reasons outlined above regarding the rejection of claim 1.

In addition, claims 2 and 3 recite, in part, "a plurality of said motor bases are linked to each other." Since these claims depend from claim 1, the recitation of "said motor bases" in these claims includes by reference: "a motor base," "a bearing supporter extending from said motor base," "a stator supporter," and "a plurality of terminals disposed around said bearing supporter." Accordingly, these claims recite structure that links entire motors together. On the other hand, Hiroyasu pertains only to a component of

a motor, a stator. The Hiroyasu Abstract refers only to a stator. Therefore, even though Hiroyasu discloses a "thin plate for the block 2," allowing manufacture "easily and continuously," Hiroyasu discloses the apparatus only for use in connection with a stator. There is no suggestion in Hiroyasu that the technique described therein for a stator could be applied to a surface mountable motor base for an entire motor comprising a motor base, a bearing supporter extending from said motor base, a stator supporter, and a plurality of terminals disposed around the bearing supporter.

In addition, the Office Action contends that the teachings of Tanaka et al., Cox et al., and Hiroyasu can be combined because they "are all from the same field of endeavor" and "the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others." Applicants respectfully disagree. Tanaka pertains to the structure of a spindle motor. (see, e.g. col. 1, lines 35-37; col. 2, line 16-col. 3, line 30) Cox pertains to a spindle motor connector for a disc drive. (see Abstract, col. 1, lines 9-10) Hiroyasu pertains to a stator core and a base for a stator core. That is, the three references pertain to different problems for different aspects of motor technology. For example, an inventor who was trying to deal with the problems disclosed in Tanaka would not seek a solution from the device in Cox because Cox deals with connectors "for providing the electrical connection path between spindle motor driver circuitry and the stator phases of a disc drive spindle motor." (col. 2, lines 35-37) Since the three references pertain to solutions for different devices having different purposes, applicants respectfully point out that it would not be obvious to combine them in order to obtain the inventions recited in claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, for these additional reasons, claims 2 and 3 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. and further in view of Hiroyasu.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3. Accordingly, claim 4 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. and further in view of Hiroyasu.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is not considered any more pertinent to applicants' disclosure than that already cited.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully solicit allowance of claims 1-4, 14, and 15.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia

  
Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

LEA:kc

Dated: March 24, 2003

Suite 301  
One Westlakes, Berwyn  
P. O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980  
(610) 407-0700

The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on:

March 24, 2003

KPC\_I:\MAT\8023US\AMEND04.DOC